Three Front War of Ideological Change

DER EINZIGE
MAR 27, 2025

50 7 8 Share



The few of you who follow me on iFunny will be aware of an argument that sprouted up in the last couple days. It's the same argument that's been plaguing the Movement™ since at least the time of Rockwell's ANP. The one between *moderates* & *radicals*, those who advocate standard political change & those who feel this is impossible. I've been involved in this discussion since I first delved into politics around 2015.

Something I should mention is that all of the people involved in this argument were more less similar ideologically. The term 'moderate' shouldn't be taken to refer to their beliefs, which are ultimately the same as the radicals. These terms simply refer to the amount of action they're willing to take in order to forward their beliefs. In practice, this debate takes the form of how much we should focus our efforts on things like electoral politics, propaganda, or outright violence. Despite slurs getting thrown around, these are tactical disagreements among people with otherwise identical ideas.

One of the primary arguments is focused on Trump, naturally. I've written a few articles that have hopefully made my opinion on Trump clear. Others have more absolute opinions, devoid of any nuance. This isn't always due to them being ignorant, it's often done deliberately in order to keep people from becoming 'deradicalized' by relatively minor victories. The alternative types do so to keep people from 'blackpilling' & falling into defeatism. Both are valid concerns.

To clarify, Trump isn't our savior. He's not even close to what we need. At this point, it's close to impossible for any major politician to be enough, for demographic reasons if nothing else. If you think significant change could ever occur through this route, you're delusional. What Trump does represent is the gradual rebirth of a Right Wing with teeth, a harsh departure from the lukewarm "conservatives" that failed to stop any of the changes of the last century. The new administration striking the Left's government power structure helps a lot, for once someone is actually going for the neck instead of wasting their time in pointless "culture war" arguments online.


The rightward shift is an obvious benefit, which can hopefully keep momentum going further. The main benefit of the Trump presidency, and all other populist movements in the West, is that they discredit the establishment. They weaken faith in the government (& its ruling ideology), opening people's minds up to an alternative. Mainstream conservatives can babble on about "draining the swamp" all they want, the truth is that the Left's *long march through the institutions* is more akin to a termite infestation than anything. If you were to totally rid the government of this infestation, you would be left with nothing. It's a cancer that cannot be treated. In times like these, electoral politics isn't about winning. It's about weakening the system, both in its effectiveness & in the minds of people.

As ideologues on the fringe, we shouldn't waste time pretending that these populists are in any way our allies. They have effects that are absolutely beneficial to us, but any support for them serves an ultimate purpose. In our case, their success is beneficial because it simultaneously hurts the Left & weakens the system. This isn't to say that you should completely ignore what's possible under standard politics, you should absolutely revel in the recent victories of the broader RW, but bear in mind that there's much more to do.

For that, I should lay out the three fronts that ideological conflict occurs on. Bear in mind that this isn't something I invented. This is based on observations from virtually every ideological conflict, from Jihadis in the Middle East to the Leftist takeover from the 1960's onwards.

X

1: Political



This is the realm of government. Where people campaign for electoral success. This isn't just limited the presidency or Congress, it can include any level of governance down to small town mayors. Importantly, it also includes the tactic known as 'entryism,' that is joining more moderate parties with the goal of pulling them closer to your ideology or otherwise advancing your own interests.

This can take various forms. Ideologues that aren't too far from mainstream appeal can do this rather openly, such as the continuous process that the Left undertook with the Democratic Party since the 60's. Political strains that are more radical have to be much more secretive, though it's still possible to cause change from within without revealing your true intentions.

The idea of doing this at a national level, at least in the US, is fairly idiotic. The mainstream conservative ideology of the Republican Party is simply too far from us to even begin to "fit in." For an example, individuals like AOC or Omar are the hardline entryists on the Left, we would need our own in the same vein as at least Richard Spencer for a similar incursion. That being said, the state level & below is far less difficult. With the exception of a few notable ones, most people don't even know who their governor is - let alone state representatives, mayor, county commissioner, sheriff, etc. It's not too uncommon for independents or third party candidates to win elections at these levels, so you could possibly forgo entryism in this manner.

All these positions have limited power, there's not much they could directly impact. But that's not their job. The most important role they play is supporting the other 2 groups. A mayor that is right-leaning can avoid harsh investigations of allied activism, or even leak information if he is directly connected to the activists. You've already seen this in action, Leftist local government often goes out of it's way to protect allied activists from being punished but will expend huge amounts of resources on finding out who left a swastika sticker on a light pole.

Something important to note is that you're not taking any public office if you have a known history of activism. Judd Blevins was a city commissioner for medium sized city in Oklahoma, he was also the leader of the Oklahoma chapter of Identity Evropa & marched in Charlottesville. He didn't do any of this anonymously (most AltRight groups didn't figure out the mask thing until later) so this was easily found out, leading to his impeachment. If you have record as an activist, don't bother. Someone will found out. Only attempt this sort of thing if you don't have any easily found links to activist groups or social media posts that you wouldn't put on a resume.

Another point on this is that you don't necessarily need be some elected official. There are plenty of people that are now working for the Republican Party that are reading BAP, Evola, etc. They are undeniably shifting the conversation within the party, bringing it much closer to the AltRight or 'dissident right' than it used to be. This is a viable strategy, though it takes a while to play out. On the other side of the aisle, Marxist thinkers have been required reading among Democratic Party staff for decades, though it wasn't always this way.

Finally, the political element doesn't need to be even related to the following elements. It can simply be a political clique that would be beneficial, or otherwise better than the alternative, even if still ultimately enemies. More on this later.

2: Activism



Activism is politics without power. Usually supporting a cause that goes against the establishment. This includes everything from propaganda, stickering, marches, internet posting, all of it. Anything to spread your ideology or at least support your goals. This is the vast majority of the conflict, and includes probably everyone reading this who posts political content online. Even memes are an important tool in this regard.

Activism can take virtually any form. Anything that supports the movement & demonizes its enemies. Sufficiently radical ideologies have two goals, supporting itself as well as discrediting the current system. Radical ideologies cannot take root if everything is more or less fine for the layman. Just as the Reds & Americans needed to discredit the Crown before they could take power, so to do we.

Not all activism is squarely directed at the movement itself. It can also take the form of supporting favorable & tangentially related movements. For example, a National Socialist group will inherently support a pro-White cause. On a grander scale, any political movement tends to support the "wing" it belongs to more often than not. This isn't necessarily because they support the mainstream element, but because it's preferable to the opposite.

3: Militants



The militants are the cutting edge of any ideology, the fanatics who enough willpower to impart it onto to the world around them. Contrary to popular belief, the amount of potential militants in any given movement is actually massive & would likely include the bulk of its activists. This doesn't mean that they will simply start attacking their enemies, but when things do escalate to that point they will likely join the fighting. There's plenty of examples of this, a good one is the German Civil War that occurred from the November Revolution in 1918 to the Beer Hall Putsch in 1923.

There was plenty of political activity in Germany for years prior, predating the World War by a couple decades. This ultimately culminated in the November Revolution but more specifically the Spartacist Uprising when Marxists began open conflict with the interim government. All of the activists that could be called "far-left" ended up grabbing rifles & fighting. In response, various right wing organizations (namely the various *Freikorps* units) also took up arms & suppressed the communists. All of these fighters were formerly simple activists, but when the opportunity arose became fighters.

More noteworthy is that many of these fighters were *not* activists. Prior to conflicts opening up, they weren't part of any organized political movement & simply had sympathies for one side or the other. It's easy to say there aren't enough people to join militant groups, it's simply a rare breed in an already fringe movement. Government attempts to stifle armed resistance certainly doesn't help. But a deep look into many ideological conflicts shows that this isn't so relevant once bullets start flying. Many people don't need some convoluted political pipeline, they just need to see violence in the streets & they will join whichever side fits their agenda the best.

In other words, it's obvious that the vast majority of even self-described NatSocs aren't going out of their way to join groups like Atomwaffen Division. Similarly, most of the Black Lives Matter crowd don't join Black Panther type organizations. However, let's say a separatist movement kicks off in the PNW. They've already secured some territory & have dealt a blow to the feds. How many people with vaguely pro-White ideologies will jump at the chance to help out? The people who might scroll through Twitter occasionally but otherwise have no presence in the Movement™. Especially if it collapses into a typical Left-Right situation, meaning anyone with vague political convictions has a place with either side's militants. As I've written about in previous articles, ideological violence has a snowball effect & spreads exponentially in most cases.

In the meantime, militants still hold an important position in ideological movements that are still relatively peaceful. The small groups like Atomwaffen Division & the Weatherman Underground, Black Order & the Red Brigades. As I've stated before, these groups don't target each other in this stage. They target the previously mentioned fronts, politicians & activists. This is important, it has the potential to deeply impact their ability to spread their agenda. Not only because one or two mouthpieces are silenced, but because it scares others into silence. It also acts as a radicalization factor, making your opponent more radical which has the effect of making your own side more radical in turn.

The biggest importance of militants at this stage is preparedness. It's having a network of fighters that can spring onto the scene when the time comes. In times of ideological conflict, once you hit the breaking point, the factions that don't have militants will become irrelevant. The new members who join an organization like the Sparticists or Freikorps are going to join the already established militant groups, they go where the fight is. If, as a hypothetical, a full civil war broke out in 2020 you would see a number of ideological factions simply disappear from relevance. Already established militant groups like Atomwaffen Division, various constitutional militias, and AntiFa will absorb the new fighters into their ranks.

In reality, these fighters don't actually need to be ideological radical in the same way as you or me. They don't need a 4 year degree on critical theory or to write an essay about *SIEGE*. They simply need to see who aligns with their interests the most & who would see them dead. If a Marxist uprising occurred right now in San Francisco, how many otherwise lukewarm leftoids do you think would jump to support or join it? Same can be said about radicals on the right.

X

As I briefly touched on earlier, these groups don't need to be part of the same organization or even strictly connected by ideology. In fact, they usually aren't. Situations like the Irish Republican Army having representation in the federal government are quite rare. The best example of this is to use the American far-right as an example.

Our political section is obviously Trump & Republican Party. The activist wing can be seen in groups like Patriot Front or NSC-131, among countless others. Including the legion of anons online. The militant wing is groups like Atomwaffen Division, The Base, & various unaffiliated cells or militias. As you probably already know, none of these sections are unified or even get along. Our political element is very far from favorable, narrowly beating out the alternative. The activists & militants are far closer ideologically, though often have disagreements about methodology or other specifics.

I will say this from the most radical perspective as an ex-AWD member. The Trump admin helps us by being vaguely RW, slowing the demographic crisis, & weakening the federal government. The activists help us by normalizing & spreading our ideology. Getting people used to seeing our kind & giving them a reason to look into us. A sticker with a swastika on it may be simple, but when attached to something like anti-migrant sentiment or displeasure with the economy it's important. It shows people that they might be closer to literal Nazis than they thought. Much of the rightward shift in the mainstream Republican party is due to this sort of activism (online & real life) since the AltRight days. It's why Elon Musk is talking about White genocide on his Twitter & Trump has expressed interest in ending birthright citizenship.

There's been a plethora of people who have adopted a more favorable view of the *evil Nazis* because of this activism. Many of these people have gone on to become activists, & even militants, in their own right. When the time comes, they likely won't have any issue joining the bloody fray.

It's important to note that politicians are all grifters. They rarely have any convictions of their own, it's mainly playing into their base. Such is life under democracy. For the most part, if the RW shifts further from center then mainstream Republicans will have to follow it. Same is true for the other side of the spectrum. This has its limits of course, but if they fail to adequately shift then they risk losing any enthusiasm from their own voting base. If someone tried running for president based on Romney style conservatism, they'd get laughed off the stage, for example. This shifting isn't accomplished by politicians, it's accomplished by the activists who care more about politics than simply voting every now & then.

The militants are the be all, end all. It's safe to say that the various factions of American politics have simply irreconcilable differences. The left & right are both drifting further from the center, and radical ideologies of all sorts are gaining momentum & broader appeal. You can't convince these groups to simply get along, their "perfect world" doesn't include the other side. If the left wins, they'd White population learns first hand what the Rhodesia-Zimbabwe transition feels like. If the right wins, no more trannies & half the spic population gets sent home. The national divorce is real. Unfortunately for some, this is less of a "split things 50/50 & move on" divorce & more like one where one side kills the other in their sleep. We can't all win, someone has to force their will on the other.

We've already seen that leftoids are perfectly capable of throwing around words like "revolution" & committing arson against a perceived enemy now that they're backed into a corner. What happens if the new administration keeps up the pressure & forces them even more into a corner? What happens if Dems win in 2028 & make it virtually impossible for even lukewarm conservatives to gain power? They already tried arresting Trump & a their militants tried to kill him twice, there's no reason they wouldn't try to do something similar to what the EU did in Romania or what various European countries try to do to "far-right" parties.

As much chaos as the constant back & forth in the US government has caused, it won't last forever. Eventually someone is going to win & fully entrench themselves in power. Dems tried this by increasing the amount of hispanics who vote blue, Reps are doing this by going after USAID & other leftoid support networks. Roughly half of American voters will learn what it's like to be fully backed into a corner. What it's like to live in what's effectively a one party system with absolutely no recourse, politicians couldn't save you even if they wanted to.

At this point all that's left is activism & militancy. Activism can't affect political change if the political element is powerless, meaning they must shift away from the system entirely & take every disenfranchised voter with them. The endgame is that either the system collapses under its own weight or militants spark revolution. Politics were always meant to be peaceful way to settle disputes without bloodshed. If the peaceful way is taken, all that's left leaves is the bloodshed. JFK has a quote about this.

The best example of this is Al-Qaeda. Throughout its early existence, AQ never had more than about 50 members. After 9/11, this grew to about 200. After the Iraq War & Arab Spring, this included tens of thousands of members. Even after the killing of OBL & general degradation of AQ central command, the various splinter groups continue to fight for jihad. Even groups that are nominally hostile to AQ, namely the Islamic State, continue with AQs stated goals of jihad. For context, the vast majority of Jihadis were not AQ members. AQ members did not do suicide bombings or make up the rank & file of the various insurgent groups in Iraq or Syria. Actual members were the commanders & organizers of these groups. They served simply to provide a central command & unified goal. This is how they managed to work regional organizations like the Taliban into their global goals.

This is important context because a similar methodology is proposed for similar NatSoc groups. The Base is literally an english translation of Al-Qaeda because the founder, Nazarro, copied the successful tactics he saw during his time in Iraq. When looking at the fairly modest size of AWD, TB, Terrorgram, etc. it becomes apparent that numbers mean nothing. Militant groups at this stage serve as vanguard elements, the commanders & commissars of future militant groups. It's a core network to grow around. Leftoid analogues like AntiFa or the John Brown Gun Club serve a similar purpose, though they usually suck at it.

I want to make this clear because many fail to grasp the point of militancy. It's a vanguard tactic, not the glorification of pointless violence for its own sake & not a resignation of defeat on the other two fronts. When it comes down to it, eventually you have to come face to face with your enemies & force them to do what you want.

Hail Victory.

Subscribe to ICØNØCLAST
By Der Einzige · Launched a year ago
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.
Type your email... Subscribe
By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.

50 Likes • 8 Restacks

50 7 8 Share

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...

Armorist Mar 27
Liked by Der Einzige
Excellent poast
LIKE (8) REPLY SHARE

Snufkin Apr 4
Liked by Der Einzige
▯■▯
LIKE (5) REPLY SHARE

5 more comments...

Top Latest Discussions

Depopulation
This is another article taking aim at something that's generally associated with the left, and recontextualizing it.
SEP 26, 2024 • DER EINZIGE



Zero Tolerance
Stop pretending enemies are friends.
AUG 1, 2024 • DER EINZIGE



Winds of Change
America, & Europe, have moved massively to the Right.
MAR 2 • DER EINZIGE



See all

Discover more from ICØNØCLAST
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.
Enter your email...
Subscribe
By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.
Already have an account? Sign in